

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. Claims 1-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mastie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,498,656. (Examiner's Action, page 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Mastie discloses tracking print jobs added to print queues. The print queues hold each print job until the print job is routed to a physical printer. It is not until the print jobs are routed to a physical printer that the physical printers are utilized. The physical printers are the output devices of Mastie. Therefore, tracking of the print jobs before they are routed to the physical printers is not tracking historical utilization information for an output device. Mastie does not disclose tracking the print jobs once they have been routed to a physical printer.

The Examiner suggests that tracking print jobs added to the print queues represent historical utilization information for output devices. This characterization is inaccurate. Print jobs added to print queues may represent potential future utilization of an output device, but certainly not historical utilization information for an output device. Therefore, Mastie does not disclose tracking or analyzing historical utilization information.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 15 include wording that historical utilization information is tracked and analyzed for optimization opportunities and a network configured to exploit the optimization opportunities found in the analysis of the historical utilization information. As Mastie does not disclose these limitations, Mastie cannot anticipate Applicant's claims.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 15 being allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all

of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Jonathan Baker

By Mark G. Pannell
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date July 19, 2005
(719) 260-7900